

U.S. Application No. 09/964,475

**REMARKS****RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JAN 19 2007**

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 24-49 remain pending.

The Applicants submitted an Information Disclosure Statement and Form PTO-1449 concurrently with the application on September 28, 2001. However, Applicants have not received an initialed Form PTO-1449 from the Examiner acknowledging consideration of the references. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner include an initialed Form PTO-1449 with the next Patent Office communication. A copy of the Form PTO-1449 filed on September 28, 2001 is attached for the Examiner's convenience.

In the Request for Continuation Application filed on September 28, 2001, the Applicants claimed priority from Japanese Patent Applications No. 09-190716, filed July 1, 1997, and No. 09-195408, filed July 22, 1997. Certified copies of the priority documents were submitted in prior application No. 09/107,986. However, the Examiner has not yet acknowledged the claim for priority, or that the priority documents were received in the parent application. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for priority in the next Patent Office Communication.

A new title has been provided as required by the Examiner.

Further, a substitute Abstract has been provided to address the Examiner's concerns set forth on pages 2-3 of the Office Action.

Claims 34, 42-45 and 49 were objected to because of informalities set forth on pages 3-4 of the Office Action. The claims have been amended with an eye to the preamble helpfully suggested by the Examiner.

## U.S. Application No. 09/964,475

Claims 34, 42-47 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being based on a non-enabling disclosure, and as missing a step regarding the result of concatenation set forth in the claims. In reply, the Applicants have amended the claims to improve their clarity and to include language that corresponds more closely with the disclosure. In this regard, the Applicants have considered and adopted many of the Examiner's helpful suggestions, but note that the language describing the concatenation of the claimed content character strings should remain substantially as examined, in order to ensure that the strings being concatenated are properly identified. In this regard, the Applicants refer the Examiner to the example set forth in Fig. 4, step 403 (normalization of the registered analyzed structured document) and Fig. 12, which elaborates on step 403. In Fig. 12, note that the upper portion of the figure shows the tree structure of the registered structured document, including element "underline" and element "text" which has a higher rank than element "underline". Upon deleting the unrequired element "underline", the middle tree structure results indicating content character string "structured" and content character string "document is a text . . .", which are then concatenated into a content character string "structured document is a text . . ." as shown in the bottom tree structure of Fig. 12.

Claims 34-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as containing minor informalities described by the Examiner on pages 6-7 of the Office Action. Claims 34 and 48 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the minor informalities set forth on pages 7-8 of the Office Action. Finally, claims 34 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as

U.S. Application No. 09/964,475

being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

The Applicants believe that each matter raised by the Examiner has been addressed in the foregoing amendments. However, if there are any remaining issues of informality, please telephone the Applicants' representative at the number below.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. ASA-724-02).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Daniel J. Stanger  
Registration No. 32,846

DJS/sdb  
(703) 684-1120